

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

TUESDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI DEVINDER GUPTA, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT APPEAL NO : 1330 of 2004

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated
29/04/2004 in WP NO : 7372 OF 1994 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

1. Karrimajji Ramulu (died), rep his legal representatives
2. Karrimajji Appala Suramma, W/o. Late Ramulu,
R/o. Ranasthalam Village & Mandal, Srikakulam District.
3. K. Surya Prakash Rao, S/o. Late Ramulu,
R/o. Ranasthalam Village & Mandal, Srikakulam District.
4. K. Krishna Rao, S/o. Late Ramulu,
R/o. Ranasthalam Village & Mandal, Srikakulam District.
5. K. Aruna Rao, S/o. Late Ramulu,
R/o. Ranasthalam Village & Mandal, Srikakulam District.
6. J. Mahalakshmi, W/o. Surappadu,
R/o. Nagampalem Village, Gummadam Post,
Laveru Mandal, Srikakulam District.
7. R. Sathyavathi, W/o. Surappadu,
R/o. Peddavegi, Eluru, West Godavari District.
8. P. Vijaya, W/o. Jaya,
R/o. Venkatarao Peta Village, Pativada Palem Post,
Ranasthalam Mandal, Srikakulam District.
9. K. Ramanamma, D/o. Late Ramulu,
R/o. Ranasthalam Village & Mandal, Srikakulam District.

..... APPELLANTS

AND

- 1 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Ranastalam Village & Mandal,
Srikakulam District.
- 2 The District Collector, Srikakulam District.
- 3 The Land Reforms Tribunal, Srikakulam District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Appellant:MR.P.VEERA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2: GP FOR REVENUE

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: None appeared.

The Court made the following :

ORAL ORDER: (per the Hon'ble the Chief Justice)

Original appellant claiming to be the tenant in respect of certain land filed the writ petition questioning the action of the respondents in seeking to evict him from the land. Appellant's case was that the land owner instead of surrendering other lands under the provisions of the A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 surrendered the land which was in possession of the appellant, and his possession was sought to be disturbed by the respondents. Learned single Judge disposed of the writ petition after taking note of the stand taken by the respondents that the petitioner-appellant had already been dispossessed on 11-8-1978 and he had not filed any objections at all in that regard. Learned single Judge thus reserved liberty to the petitioner-appellant to avail other statutory remedies available to him under the various provisions of the Revenue laws. Aggrieved by the said disposal of the writ petition, the present appeal has been filed.

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that representation had been submitted and possession has not been taken by the respondents and limitation might come in the way of the appellant in protecting his possession since appellant is already in possession.

We need not, in this appeal, go into all these questions inasmuch as the appellant, in order to protect his rights, must approach the concerned authorities who are invested with powers to adjudicate such claim as is being raised by the appellant. With such leave and liberty granted to the appellant, the appeal is dismissed.

DEVINDER GUPTA, CJ

14-9-2004

C.V.RAMULU, J

Tvr

To

- 1 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Ranastalam Village & Mandal,
Srikakulam District.
- 2 The District Collector, Srikakulam District.
- 3 The Land Reforms Tribunal, Srikakulam District.

4 2 CCs to the Government pleader for Revenue, High Court
Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT).

5 2 CD copies.